

Applicants : Borkowski et al.  
Serial No. :10/723,804  
Filed : November 26, 2003  
Page : 13 of 18

Attorney's Docket No.: Intel-007PUS  
Intel Docket Number: P17383

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached replacement 6 sheets of drawings include changes to FIGS. 1 to 6 and replace the 6 original sheets including FIGS. 1 to 6.

In Figures 1 to 6, handwritten text and other informalities were replaced with typed text.

Attachments following last page of this Amendment:

Replacement Sheet (6 pages)

Applicants : Borkowski et al.  
Serial No. : 10/723,804  
Filed : November 26, 2003  
Page : 14 of 18

Attorney's Docket No.: Intel-007PUS  
Intel Docket Number: P17383

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 6 to 18 and 20 to 35 are pending in this application of which claims 1, 20, 22, 30 and 35 are the independent claims. Claims 3 to 5 and 19 are cancelled without prejudice. Claims 32 to 35 are new. Favorable reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claims 7 to 12 would be allowed if amended to include the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings on the coversheet of the office action, but the Examiner has not indicated why the drawings are objected. Based on the attached drawing replacement sheets, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the drawing objection. Otherwise, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate why the drawings are objected.

Claims 1 to 6, 13, 18 to 24 and 30 to 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being obvious over Nelson (U.S. Patent Number 5,005,170).

Claim 1 is directed to a method that includes receiving successive frames carrying data in timeslots. The timeslots are assigned to channels so that data for the channels include interleaved data. The method also includes aggregating the data from successive frames for each of a predetermined number of the timeslots and mapping the aggregated data, by timeslot, to produce a timeslot-based map. The mapping includes storing the aggregated data in a first buffer. The method further includes remapping the aggregated data in the timeslot-based map to

produce a channel-based map by storing the aggregated data stored in the first buffer in a second buffer according to timeslot-remap information to re-order the aggregated data stored in the timeslot-based map. The timeslot-remap information includes a table, and the table includes an address and an increment value associated with each of the timeslots in a frame.

The applied art is not understood to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of claim 1. In particular, Nelson does not disclose or suggest remapping the aggregated data in the timeslot-based map to produce a channel-based map by storing the aggregated data stored in the first buffer in a second buffer according to timeslot-remap information to re-order the aggregated data stored in the timeslot-based map.

The Examiner has indicated that Nelson discloses that the multiplexer 17 and the switch 18 have memories that store the mapped and remapped data; and therefore, Nelson discloses storing the aggregated data stored in the first buffer in a second buffer according to timeslot-remap information to re-order the aggregated data stored in the timeslot-based map (see page 3 of the Office Action). Applicants respectfully disagree. Nelson does not disclose or suggest how or if the switch 18 is actually used as a second buffer to store aggregated data according to the timeslot-remap information to re-order the aggregated data stored in the timeslot-based map. Nelson discloses that the switch 18 operates using a routine 22 in FIG. 8 of Nelson (see column 8, lines 31 to 36 of Nelson). As understood by Applicants, the routine 22 does not disclose or suggest using a second buffer as recited in claim 1 (see Fig. 8 and column 10, line 6 to column 11, line48 of Nelson).

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not shown in Nelson where a second buffer to store aggregated data according to timeslot-remap information is explicitly taught. If the Examiner is make an inference, then Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide support (See MPEP §2112 Part IV). The fact that a certain result or characteristic may occur or be present in the prior art is not sufficient to establish the inherency of that result or characteristic (see *In re Rijckaert*, 9 F.3d 1531, 1534, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1957 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Oelrich*, 666 F.2d 578, 581-82, 212 USPQ 323, 326 (CCPA 1981)). "To establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence 'must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. Inherency, however, may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient' " (emphasis added, see *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950-51 (Fed. Cir. 1999)).

If, on the other hand, the Examiner is indicating that it is obvious in the Nelson reference to remap the aggregated data in the timeslot-based map to produce a channel-based map by storing the aggregated data stored in the first buffer in a second buffer according to timeslot-remap information to re-order the aggregated data stored in the timeslot-based map, then Applicants respectfully submit that the §102 rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Therefore, Applicants submit that Nelson does not disclose or suggest remapping the aggregated data in the timeslot-based map to produce a channel-based map by storing the aggregated data stored in the first buffer in a second buffer according to timeslot-remap

information to re-order the aggregated data stored in the timeslot-based map. For at least this reason, claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 20, 22, 30 and 35 include the corresponding feature of remapping as recited in claim 1. Applicants submit that the Nelson reference should also be withdrawn with respect to claims 20, 22, 30 and 35 for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Also, claims 20, 22, 30 and 35 are further distinguished from Nelson because Nelson does not disclose or suggest that the remapping includes reading bytes of aggregated data for the timeslot from the first buffer, determining a destination address in the second buffer according to the associated address in the table and storing the first byte of the aggregated data for the timeslot in the second buffer at the destination address.

Furthermore, claims 30 and 35 are further distinguished from Nelson because Nelson does not disclose or suggest that remapping includes incrementing the destination address by the associated increment value and storing a next byte of the aggregated data for the timeslot in the second buffer at the incremented destination address.

Moreover, claim 35 is further distinguished from Nelson because Nelson does not disclose or suggest that remapping includes repeating the incrementing and the storing a next byte until all of the bytes of the aggregated data for the timeslot have been stored in the second buffer.

Applicants submit that all dependent claims now depend on allowable independent claims.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants request withdrawal of the art rejections.

Applicants : Borkowski et al.  
Serial No. : 10/723,804  
Filed : November 26, 2003  
Page : 18 of 18

Attorney's Docket No.: Intel-007PUS  
Intel Docket Number: P17383

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for withdrawing the prior art cited with regards to any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicants submit that the entire application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' attorney can be reached by telephone at (781) 401-9988 ext. 23.

No fee is believed to be due for this Response; however, if any fees are due, please apply such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0845 referencing Attorney Docket: Intel-007PUS.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Anthony T. Moosey  
Reg. No. 55,773

Date: June 15, 2007

Attorneys for Intel Corporation  
Daly, Crowley, Mofford & Durkee, LLP  
354A Turnpike Street - Suite 301A  
Canton, MA 02021-2714  
Telephone: (781) 401-9988 ext. 23  
Facsimile: (781) 401-9966